

Executive Summary

KDE Follow-up Question and Answer Document September 5, 2013 Superintendents' Summit

Introduction

On September 5, 2013, Commissioner Terry Holliday and Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) leadership met with all Kentucky local district superintendents in Frankfort for a face-to-face Superintendents' Summit. The Summit provided an opportunity for Commissioner Holliday to explain the why, what and how of the P-12 components of the Unbridled Learning: College and Career Readiness for All system. In addition, superintendents heard presentations on key topics and were given the opportunity through roundtable discussions to share feedback on the issues. This detailed feedback has been compiled into a document, attached to this Executive Summary, and responses from KDE staff to each comment/question submitted by superintendents are included in the document. The feedback is being used by KDE staff internally in conversations around the scope and progress of the agency's work.

This Executive Summary and the detailed responses in the following pages are provided to allow all stakeholders with the opportunity to review the valuable insights gained at the summit as well as provide consistent responses to questions. As this information is communicated throughout the state and new questions arise, KDE will update the detailed document to promote continuous, accurate communication on education issues.

Impact of Superintendents' Feedback

Feedback received from superintendents both prior to and at the September 5th summit has been extremely valuable in shaping KDE's work. The impact of this feedback can already be seen in the following examples:

- Holding a statewide superintendents' summit on September 5th and the appearance of Governor Steve Beshear and First Lady Jane Beshear at the summit to thank superintendents for their tremendous work in improving college and career readiness
- Addition of Dr. Tommy Floyd as KDE Chief of Staff to improve communication and follow-up
- A "Superintendent Spotlight" feature added in the commissioner's *Fast Five on Friday* e-mail
- A September 17, 2013 press conference conducted by Governor Steve Beshear and Commissioner Terry Holliday presenting a strong progress report for Kentucky schools
- Production of ASSIST training materials on superintendent evaluation to be available October 1, 2013

- Notification of superintendents first before sending special e-mails to local board chairs. Superintendents received the invitation first that was going to local board chairs about the opportunity for board members to become a member of the Local School Board Members Advisory Council.
- Commissioner Holliday's meeting with the Kentucky Association of School Superintendents' Executive Board
- Delay in the timeline for the implementation of the Teacher Professional Growth and Effectiveness System and the Principal Professional Growth and Effectiveness System for personnel decisions and state accountability until 2015-16
- Delay of the timeline for the implementation of the Superintendent Professional Growth and Effectiveness System by one year. There will be a summative evaluation form available in 2014-15.
- Pursuing a delay of state accountability for the new science standards until at least 2016, giving science educators a few years to fully transition
- Pursuing a delay in the implementation of the World Language Program Review
- Pursuing a slowing down of the progress for the development of the social studies standards
- Continued communications on Redbook issues
- Switching the order of two of KDE's budget priorities for the 2014 legislative session that are being recommended to the Kentucky Board of Education
- Issuance of a communications survey that will soon go out to all local district superintendents to help KDE improve its current communication methods and pursue additional ones

Summary of Presentations and Findings from the September 5th Superintendents' Summit

(Note: The detailed feedback and KDE's responses to the feedback on each topic found below appear in the attachment to this executive summary.)

- ***Superintendent Professional Growth and Effectiveness System*** – In general, there seemed to be confusion over the difference between what needs to occur by December 2013 in ASSIST and the eventual development of a Kentucky Superintendent Professional Growth and Effectiveness System. The summit presentation covered both topics. First, an explanation was given on the expectations and timelines for superintendent/local board of education conversations on delivery targets, budget and support and the facilities/resources portion of the TELL Kentucky Survey and the loading of corresponding evidences related to those conversations into ASSIST by December 20, 2013. Additionally, a summary and explanation of the new Superintendent Effectiveness Steering Committee work was provided. This work will eventually result in a 2014-15 statewide pilot and 2015-16 statewide implementation of the Superintendent Professional Growth and Effectiveness System.

Widespread concern was expressed by superintendents on the need for extensive training for local board of education members as part of this new effectiveness system for superintendents. KDE is already collaborating with the Kentucky School Boards Association for essential items that will be included in this training.

A consensus from superintendents also existed on the need for training/support on the evidence/upload process required through ASSIST by December 20. KDE is already developing, testing and will soon be providing support materials to all local district superintendents for the ASSIST upload process. Additionally, KDE will continue to communicate with all superintendents on the progress of the work of the Superintendent Effectiveness Steering Committee.

- ***Principal Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PPGES)*** – Superintendents indicated that the PPGES creates great opportunities for deeper conversations and a more defined system for determining effectiveness for principals. Indications were that the data related to growth goals is a strong component within the system. The cost of principal evaluator certification is of concern as part of the system's implementation.

Superintendents noted that greater clarity is needed on how assistant principals will be evaluated. Also, communication around the PPGES system needs equal emphasis as compared to the system for teachers so that the process is transparent. More face-to-face training was suggested rather than webinars to assist in implementation efforts. Superintendents expressed that greater clarification on the role of the TELL Survey should be provided because there are questions about what is actually learned from the data that relates to determining principal effectiveness.

Repeated input was received on the need to have principals exit their training programs with adequate preparation and support to implement PPGES on day-one of their principal assignment and the fact that this would require greater collaboration between KDE, the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) and universities.

Superintendents aren't sure that the Kentucky Education Association (KEA) will remain on board with the new system for principals and teachers given the local conversations with KEA leaders. Comments suggested more work is needed to ensure KEA buy-in continues because it is critical to avoid negative messaging at the local level. Another clear message was the need to continue training through the cooperatives to support system implementation.

- ***Teacher Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (TPGES)*** – In general, superintendents felt the TPGES is a stronger system than the PPGES for evaluation purposes. It was indicated that the field test provides an opportunity for teachers and leaders to become familiar with the system components and develop buy-in. Comments reflected that the system allows for a common language statewide for determining effectiveness.

Concerns surfaced about the need to have all cooperatives use the same language in training. Also, TPGES budget concerns are surfacing and it is clear financial supports must be in place to ensure growth and effectiveness of teachers and leaders. Superintendents asked that data from the field test should be shared broadly so all districts are aware of the challenges and successes in early implementation.

Superintendents expressed that the cooperatives should provide support and share successful implementation models in a more intentional manner during the 2013-14 school year. It was felt that this would allow for more face-to-face trainings, which was also preferred by many superintendents as new processes and protocols are learned.

- **Budget** – The budget presentation on September 5th discussed the funding levels for primary and secondary education (K-12) over the last six years. Average Daily Attendance (ADA) has increased steadily, but total state funding levels have declined. Federal funding is currently at 2007-08 levels, and with sequestration, will continue to decline significantly. A clear consensus existed among superintendents that the inadequacy of funding for K-12 has reached critical levels.

The presentation discussed several potential funding priorities for additional funding requests that need to be considered by the Kentucky Board of Education. Superintendents generally supported these priorities and agreed these would provide flexibility for districts, but it was conveyed that there shouldn't have to be a choice in priorities made for funding. The presentation also noted that current general fund revenues for the Commonwealth remain relatively flat moving forward and no new revenue is available for K-12, unless the General Assembly generates additional revenue. Superintendents expressed strong support for a unified and consistent message from all stakeholders for increased revenue and funding for K-12 in the upcoming legislative session. The department will present this feedback to the Kentucky Board of Education at its October 8, 2013 meeting and continue to communicate with key stakeholders, including superintendents, legislators and educational partners on the importance of adequately funding K-12 education in Kentucky.

- **KSBIT** – The KSBIT presentation provided a status update on the KSBIT process. It was reported that the Department of Insurance (DOI) has postponed a hearing to determine the methodology and assessment amounts until a final plan is submitted by the KSBIT Board to DOI.

Superintendents voiced strong concerns about the accuracy and validity of the initial assessment amounts that had been provided by KSBIT and requested a detailed breakdown of the actual data supporting those numbers for their respective school districts. Various questions were also voiced about the tentative timeframe and potential next steps. KDE will share this feedback with KSBIT and continue to closely monitor the situation and make school districts aware of any additional updates moving forward.

➤ **Assessment –**

What is working well?

Two clear messages came through on what is working well. First, the School Report Card and the Open House model are very beneficial to all stakeholders. Having a one-stop shop website helps everyone see the data and get quick access. In addition, the release of the individual student data at the beginning of August was very positive. Schools were able to at least see individual scores to help make some instructional decisions.

What needs improvement?

The most talked about issue was the Growth Model. The normative nature of the Student Growth Percentile (SGP) seems to be counter-intuitive to educational practice and makes setting goals for growth impossible. It appears to be a moving target with one year of high scores followed by the next year of low scores, even though the teachers and instruction didn't change. Superintendents expressed that the growth weight at elementary (40%) is too high.

Several tables of superintendents brought up the need for an earlier release of test data. Many would like to get scores released in June or mid-July.

Program Reviews was another topic of discussion. Many comments focused on issues with Program Reviews that included communication, scoring rubrics, the massive amount of time needed to complete these, and the benefit of the whole process. Some brought up the idea of returning to traditional tests for the Program Review areas.

Career definitions were noted as being in need of improvement. Many would like to see updated definitions and perhaps a career path for those in the arts.

What are some suggested ideas?

Loudly and clearly, many said “stay the course” with the current model. It was felt that even though there may be issues, it is to the benefit of teachers, principals and central office staff to change course only after letting the current system stabilize. Another suggestion was to weight achievement more in the accountability system. Particularly, it was noted that the weight of achievement at the elementary level needs to be increased. Finally, a desire exists to make tablets viable for online testing. KDE understands that as Kentucky moves toward online testing in more arenas, tablets must become viable platforms for giving online tests.

What will KDE do to make improvements?

Concerning the overall system, KDE has pledged to continually review the assessment and accountability system. Starting with this year's one-year trend data and combining it with the year-two trend data, KDE will analyze the data, discuss it, solicit feedback and make suggestions on changes to the system.

Some areas can be addressed at this time. Those changes include continuing to work with test vendors to make tablets viable platforms for online testing, and constantly reviewing and exploring new career definitions and adding those new definitions when appropriate.

However, some areas will be problematic and hard to solve. For instance, the schedule for returning test results earlier without significant costs or elimination of constructed response questions will remain tough issues to solve in the near future. KDE may be able to increase the return of results a few days earlier than August 1, but that would be the maximum response for now.

As to returning to traditional testing for Program Review areas, this is not allowed by Senate Bill 1. A change in state law would need to occur to address this request.

Additional Information from KDE in Response to Superintendents' Concerns – Standards Update

(Note: The delays referenced below are based on superintendents' feedback and budget concerns. The final decisions about implementation will be made following the 2014 legislative session.)

Science Standards – Over the next few years, Kentucky teachers will be transitioning to the Next Generation Science Standards. KDE has launched Leadership Networks to provide professional learning opportunities to educators to build a collective understanding for the intended learning outcomes in these standards. KDE will be pursuing a delay of state accountability for the new science standards until at least 2016, giving science educators a few years to fully transition.

Social Studies Standards – The Social Studies C3 Framework has just been released and KDE staff is reviewing it to see if the framework meets Senate Bill 1 requirements for rigorous standards. The early indication from numerous national groups is that the framework does not meet rigorous requirements, so we are looking at our next steps for social studies standards development. A group of Kentucky educators and experts in the field have convened to begin these discussions. However, KDE will be pursuing a slowing down of the progress for the development of these standards. Given the discussion that emerged from the science standards, we want to gather as much feedback and input from Kentucky educators as possible before taking the next steps.

World Language Program Review Update – Due to the recent feedback from the Superintendents' Summit and education cooperative meetings, KDE plans to pursue slowing down the implementation of the World Language Program Review. While language and culture remain critical facets of learning for preparing students for a global workforce, the transition to implementation of this Program Review may require more significant shifts in local programming options. KDE suggests districts and schools engage in deeper conversations with their local businesses and communities to maintain a focus on world language competencies.

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – SUPERINTENDENT

Topic	Question	Response
<p>Clarification on logistics</p>	<p>In general there is confusion over the difference between what is happening for December 2013 in ASSIST and the development of the PGES for superintendents. Many of the questions submitted confuse the two.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why upload the information in spring/summer 2014? What is the value if nothing has changed from Dec. 2013? 2. What does the school board chair have to submit by Dec. 2013 about evaluations of superintendents? 	<p>The work of the Kentucky Superintendent PGES Steering Committee, which began in Aug. 2013, is intended to collaboratively develop a superintendent effectiveness system and supporting documentation for a 2014-15 statewide pilot and a 2015-2016 statewide implementation.</p> <p>Beginning with the 2014-15 statewide pilot, districts may choose the newly developed system or utilize their own locally developed systems if it is comparable to the state system. These districts that go with a locally developed system will be provided with a rubric to align it to the state developed system/documents.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Commissioner's request for artifacts/evidence regarding Delivery Targets/PGES; Budget and Support; and the Facilities/Resources portion of TELL being uploaded into ASSIST is to document ongoing conversations between superintendents and boards in the fall semester (by Dec. 20) and then again in the spring semester (by June 30). 2. The school board chair does not submit anything by December of 2013 regarding the evaluation of the superintendent. The superintendent or designee is requested to complete the artifacts/evidence process in ASSIST by December of 2013. A training video/webinar detailing this process will be communicated in early October 2013.
<p>Clarification on the model for</p>	<p>3. Where is the state in deciding which</p>	<p>3. The Kentucky Superintendent Effectiveness System is</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – SUPERINTENDENT

Topic	Question	Response
evaluation moving forward	<p>model we will have for superintendent effectiveness? (New Evaluation)</p> <p>4. Does the superintendent have to do a recap or “state of the district” at the time of evaluation?</p>	<p>scheduled for a statewide pilot in the 2014-15 school year, and then statewide implementation during the 2015-2016 school year. The KY Superintendent Effectiveness System Steering Committee work is now underway.</p> <p>4. The current request is for superintendents to discuss plans/progress with their boards each semester on Delivery Targets/PGES; Budget and Support; and Facilities/Resources portion of TELL. These discussions can occur at one board meeting or over the course of several board meetings each semester.</p>
ASSIST/Documentation for 2013	<p>5. How will the ASSIST documentation be used for superintendent evaluations that occur other than in June?</p> <p>6. Does the superintendent have to present in a board meeting for the documentation to count? Can finance officers present the finance piece?</p> <p>7. Is the conversation the board has on these areas in relation to the superintendent evaluation?</p> <p>8. Could KDE provide a sample board minutes statement to clarify how much detail should be provided; in general, ours are very vague.</p> <p>9. There has not been a lot of support for using ASSIST for this system.</p> <p>10. Will there be feedback once it is uploaded into ASSIST?</p> <p>11. Flexibility in the submission process (ASSIST) needs to exist until the system is fully developed.</p> <p>12. We need a model sample template with goals that will be in ASSIST before</p>	<p>5. The ASSIST artifact/evidence is required for each semester. There is no set requirement on how the board/superintendent team wishes to incorporate the ASSIST discussions into their current evaluation system.</p> <p>6. The superintendent should lead the discussion with board members in open board meeting. The superintendent may utilize the expertise of all available district staff for specifics on any topic as desired, such as the finance officer.</p> <p>7. The topics requested on Delivery Targets/PGES; Budget and Support; and Facilities/Resources portion of TELL are all excellent criteria for boards to utilize for superintendent evaluation and discussions related to student performance.</p> <p>8. KDE will provide a training video and supporting materials in early October 2013. Minutes should simply document that the conversations between the board members and superintendent have taken place.</p> <p>9. The ASSIST upload instructional video will be released in early October. In general, you will answer a list of multiple choice questions on the three areas of discussion and then upload the digital documents</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – SUPERINTENDENT

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>meetings with boards this month or next.</p> <p>13. How many clicks will it take to enter the data into ASSIST?</p> <p>14. ASSIST is not user-friendly.</p> <p>15. Boards know nothing about ASSIST. How are they supposed to put evaluations in there?</p> <p>16. Someone should talk to each superintendent to ensure we know what to do for December 20. No consistent information exists.</p>	<p>(board meeting minutes) that are your supporting evidence.</p> <p>10. There will be support prior to the upload as needed and feedback as requested following the upload.</p> <p>11. Flexibility and instructions will be explained in the ASSIST upload video in early October.</p> <p>12. The superintendent and board may want to set goals based on the three areas of discussion, which have been clearly defined. Nothing in ASSIST will ask you to go beyond those three discussion items and supporting evidence at this time. (Will be addressed in ASSIST video).</p> <p>13. The number of clicks required to upload into ASSIST will be as few as possible for completion.</p> <p>14. The ASSIST upload instructional video will be released in early October and will be intended to make ASSIST access more user-friendly.</p> <p>15. The superintendent or designee will be utilizing the ASSIST discussion assurances as well as the artifacts/evidence upload. Board members do not upload this into ASSIST.</p> <p>16. The ASSIST upload instructions and video will be released in early October. For additional support, please contact Dr. Tommy Floyd at 502-564-3141 or tommy.floyd@education.ky.gov</p>
Comments/Concerns/Issues	<p>In general, there is pervasive concern about boards' understanding and the training it will take in order for them to be fair in the process.</p> <p>17. It is aligning superintendents and the board.</p> <p>18. It sets clear expectations for the board.</p>	<p>KDE is working collaboratively with KSBA regarding the urgency and impact of school board member training on both the ASSIST requirement and the future superintendent effectiveness options.</p> <p>17. - 21. General comments</p> <p>22. The ASSIST upload instructions and video will be released in early October.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – SUPERINTENDENT

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>19. If teachers and principals are evaluated, then it's good for superintendents to be also.</p> <p>20. Evidence has helped the superintendents.</p> <p>21. Having Tommy Floyd involved in the development is a positive.</p> <p>22. Communication on this so far has been sporadic.</p> <p>23. 'I know nothing'.</p> <p>24. The good is lost in the massiveness of the process. There are too many indicators.</p> <p>25. New superintendents are serving 3 masters: federal, state and local. They are worried about overload.</p> <p>26. The process reinforces the conversation between the board and superintendent; it helps provide focus to board members.</p> <p>27. Technology issues with ASSIST/CIITS are not fully developed and are a barrier.</p> <p>28. Buy-in is a barrier.</p> <p>29. This process highjacks local board authority.</p> <p>30. I am offended that there is implication that superintendents are not talking about TELL, delivery targets, etc. with boards.</p> <p>31. This could be good if it focuses on teaching and learning.</p> <p>32. The TELL Survey should not be used.</p> <p>33. We need the legislature to change the rule to require board members to have beyond a GED.</p> <p>34. It is not that different from ISLIC.</p> <p>35. It must not be cumbersome.</p> <p>36. It must be easy to do.</p>	<p>The efforts and progress of the newly formed KY Superintendent Effectiveness Steering Committee will be continually communicated throughout 2013-14 through multiple venues including the Commissioner's Monday E-mail and Fast Five on Friday, KDE co-op reports and superintendent membership organizations, such as KASS and KASA. In addition, shortly after each steering committee meeting, minutes will be posted on the commissioner's advisory council webpage where you will find a link to the Superintendent Effectiveness Steering Committee webpage.</p> <p>24. Efforts are underway by the Superintendent Effectiveness Steering committee to arrive at a more user-friendly document/system.</p> <p>25. The eventual KY Superintendent Effectiveness System is intended to provide a model to meet of all of these requirements to assist superintendents and boards to effectively and efficiently meet the needs of students.</p> <p>26. This is a general comment and we appreciate the feedback.</p> <p>27. Like most technology, these systems are constantly in development. If we wait to use them until they are fully developed, we will miss opportunities for improvement and run the risk that the technology will be antiquated by the time it is fully developed. ASSIST upload instructions and the video will be released in early October and will clearly walk users through the process.</p> <p>28. This is a general comment. Hopefully with support and clear instructions, superintendents can feel comfortable in the process.</p> <p>29. The process is intended to provide leverage for the superintendents/board teams on topics that positively</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – SUPERINTENDENT

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>37. One size does not fit all and everyone can't be painted with the same brush.</p> <p>38. A disconnect between superintendent evaluation and district performance will exist.</p> <p>39. It must focus on the right things.</p> <p>40. The great ideas behind it are on target.</p> <p>41. Great potential exists, but we put the cart in front of the horse (no clarification).</p> <p>42. It helps the conversation between boards and superintendents to be around the right things.</p> <p>43. We shouldn't be evaluated on it this year since we don't understand ASSIST.</p> <p>44. It is too complex for blue collar boards.</p> <p>45. It is just something else to get in the way of teaching and learning.</p> <p>46. Finland has no evaluation system and no tenure.</p> <p>47. Universities are not changing.</p> <p>48. It looks like the new process is just about compliance and is too massive.</p> <p>49. Board members will have to be willing to dedicate time to do this.</p> <p>50. It needs to be general to allow some flexibility. If it gets too specific, there will be problems.</p>	<p>impact student achievement. Flexibility and autonomy will be an included component of the final KY Superintendent Effectiveness System.</p> <p>30. - 42. General Comments</p> <p>43. In this case, ASSIST is the conduit through which to share this information with KDE. The upload instructions and video will be released in early October and should provide clarity. Eventually the various elements in ASSIST will tie together into a comprehensive system to support school improvement. Superintendents will not be evaluated using the system until 2014-15.</p> <p>44. – 50. These are general comments. Thank you for sharing these.</p>
<p>Suggestions</p>	<p>51. There needs to be school board member training on the what, why and how of the system without using education jargon.</p> <p>52. Could this be a part of the assurances if no one or KDE is checking it?</p> <p>53. Flexibility needs to be built into the</p>	<p>51. KDE is working collaboratively with KSBA regarding the urgency and impact of school board member training on both the ASSIST requirement and the future Superintendent Effectiveness System options.</p> <p>52. The ASSIST process will be monitored.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – SUPERINTENDENT

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>system. Many superintendents are buying in but not necessarily their school boards.</p> <p>54. Quality training for school boards must be developed because many do not understand an evaluation process. They must be taught how to eliminate bias in an evaluation process.</p> <p>55. We must work with legislators to improve requirements for board members since currently board members are only required to have a GED; yet, being board members is one of the most important jobs in the state.</p> <p>56. The TELL Survey should be used to assess facilities.</p> <p>57. We need a timeline with what needs to be done by when. Everything has to be loaded by Dec. 20. ASSIST doesn't update until Oct. 21. Include in the timeline when data can be expected that impacts the evaluation.</p> <p>58. TELL is only every two years; what do we do in the between years?</p> <p>59. Slow down the process with a phase-in to train boards.</p> <p>60. Prepare materials for training to explain to boards why the state is overstepping its bounds.</p> <p>61. Keep it general; it should not be too detailed.</p> <p>62. Standards language needs to be in the language of the board.</p> <p>63. Guide us step by step and hold our hands.</p>	<p>53. – 55. KDE is working collaboratively with KSBA regarding the urgency and impact of school board member training on both the ASSIST requirement and the future Superintendent Effectiveness System options.</p> <p>56. General Comment</p> <p>57. Discussions regarding the Delivery Targets/PGES; Budget and Support; and the Facilities/Resources portion of TELL should be ongoing and can occur prior to the ASSIST tool being open. The deadline for checking off on the assurances on the conversations about the three topics and uploading evidence is Dec. 20 for the fall semester and June 30 for the spring semester.</p> <p>58. The superintendent can always give updates to the board on TELL portions where plans are being implemented for district improvement.</p> <p>59. – 61. These are general comments. Thank you for these.</p> <p>62. The KY Superintendent Effectiveness Steering Committee is committed to a user-friendly system including flexibility.</p> <p>63. The ASSIST upload instructions and video will be released in early October.</p> <p>64. KDE is working collaboratively with KSBA regarding the urgency and impact of school board member training on both the ASSIST requirement and the future Superintendent Effectiveness System options.</p> <p>65. The KY Superintendent Effectiveness Steering Committee is committed to a user-friendly system including flexibility.</p> <p>66. KDE will continue cross-functional team discussions to ensure usage of common terminology.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – SUPERINTENDENT

Topic	Question	Response
	64. Board training must be face-to-face. 65. Stress flexibility. 66. Language should have a lexicon at all levels of PGES for common understanding; it should not depend on who trains them.	

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013
TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – PRINCIPALS

Topic	Question	Response
Clarification/ understanding the model	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is Val-Ed? What is its purpose? 2. How many actual standards exist for the principal assessment? 3. How will principal growth work? What will be the measures used? 4. It is not clear how assistant principals will be evaluated. 5. Does it matter if professional development (PD) materials are accessed through CIITS or PD 360 for tracking completion? 6. When will DRAFT come off documents? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Val-Ed is a 360° assessment. It is intended to be taken by the principal, the principal's supervisor, and all teachers in the school. 360° assessments provide the best feedback to principals because they incorporate the input of all members of the school's professional community. See the following link: http://education.ky.gov/teachers/HQT/Pages/PPGES-Principal-Professional-Growth-and-Effectiveness-System.aspx and click on Val-Ed Summary. 2. There are 7 standards based on the work of Dr. James Stronge. 3. Principal growth will be measured based on Student Growth, Val-Ed, and the TELL KY Working Conditions Goal. 4. The ESEA Waiver focuses on the teacher and principal. Decisions about the assistant principal are under consideration now. 5. It does not matter. Instructions on how to register are available at: http://education.ky.gov/teachers/HQT/Pages/PPGES-Principal-Professional-Growth-and-Effectiveness-System.aspx and click on How to Register for the PPGES PD 360 Course. 6. DRAFT will not come off until the pilot year is complete and all aspects of the PPGES have been approved by the Kentucky Board of Education.
Consequences	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. What is going to happen when principals mark most of the teachers as a 3 or proficient and the student overall scores cause a school to be a Focus School or Needs Improvement? What if a superintendent feels a principal is a 3 or proficient but the school still struggles in many areas? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Fidelity of implementation of the TPGES and PPGES will be monitored annually. Hence, there should be some correlation between effectiveness ratings and overall student learning outcomes. Districts will be expected to self-monitor ratings and create growth opportunities for principals and teachers in both systems to address areas of concern for continuous improvement of the system as well as the educators. All data from PGES should influence local human capital management decisions.

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013
TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – PRINCIPALS

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>8. In general, suggestions and concerns trend around the TELL Survey, its validity, what to do with it on the other side; the time necessary to conduct this; communication around the process; wanting more face-to-face training unless there are better videos; and more opportunity to learn from field test districts.</p>	<p>8. TELL KY Working Conditions Goals are being used to allow principals and superintendents to collaborate on how to use the data to improve not only working conditions, but a principal's growth on standards. Time is a capacity issue that is not easily fixed. As principals and superintendents work through the process, we hope they will develop a higher degree of comfort and become streamlined in the process. Communication is available through monthly webcasts and twice monthly PGES newsletters. This link will take you to the PPGES web page http://education.ky.gov/teachers/HQT/Pages/PPGES-Principal-Professional-Growth-and-Effectiveness-System.aspx.</p> <p>Additional video clips are being created to support the process and should be available as just-in-time support. KLA is working to add more conversation from the field at upcoming KLA events.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013
TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – PRINCIPALS

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>9. Could superintendents get together again and let pilot superintendents go over the document piece by piece? That way everyone would have the same training module. It would help to have field test districts share.</p> <p>10. Communication around the process needs to be more transparent, on a calendar and with common training for understanding.</p> <p>11. The Val-Ed Survey is cumbersome and needs to be replaced or modified.</p> <p>12. Clarification across districts on values and terms needs to occur.</p> <p>13. There needs to be more face-to-face professional development with fewer webinars.</p> <p>14. More balance by KDE needs to occur between the teacher and principal systems.</p> <p>15. KDE needs to allow training through the co-operatives instead of KLA and provide it in the summer.</p> <p>16. We need to implement the system in phases to incur less financial strain.</p> <p>17. A conversation between KDE and KEA needs to occur about the why, how and on what to provide consistent information and support. Some KEA regional folks are promoting negative information on uses of the TELL Survey data.</p> <p>18. KDE and higher education need to discuss strategies to ensure new teachers/principals come out ready to use the PGES system.</p> <p>19. We need help finding more time and ways to provide flexibility.</p>	<p>9. This would be a very appropriate activity for the superintendents to experience in KSN/KASS meetings OR activities hosted by KASA OR cooperative meeting activities for support.</p> <p>10. KLA continues to support the training around all of PGES including PPGES. That training is common and is being presented by the same team based on the region.</p> <p>11. See question #1 in this section. The concern is noted.</p> <p>12. We will continue to work to be consistent in messaging. KDE will work to create a quick guide for terminology for system use.</p> <p>13. KLA is providing regional face-to-face opportunities through the cooperatives. Webcasts and webinars assist given the burden of costs associated with face-to-face.</p> <p>14. KDE is working to ensure that more information goes out about the PPGES. However, this system has fewer new aspects than the TPGES.</p> <p>15. KLA is in place for this year. Each coop has a PGES consultant for support of the PGES process.</p> <p>16. KDE has attempted to do so by using a field test process last year and a pilot this year.</p> <p>17. KEA is a partner in the process and KDE will communicate this concern.</p> <p>18. This conversation is underway and the parties at the table are collaborating around this concern.</p> <p>19. Capacity development is a challenge. KDE will work to provide resources based on successes from the field. Principals may also collaborate through the use of Wiggio and KLA.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013
TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – PRINCIPALS

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>20. Clarification on the role of the TELL Survey needs to occur to determine if what it tells us is really the information that we need.</p> <p>21. Expectations need to be clear and common standards followed throughout the state.</p> <p>22. Push the timeline out.</p> <p>23. Make the argument with USED that we are a high performer and want to do this right.</p> <p>24. We need more understanding of what TELL is and what it does showing how the information can be used for making improvement; currently, many angry responses exist.</p> <p>25. We need communication like PGES.</p> <p>26. Create it in smaller chunks to make it more do-able; be clear how the process impacts improvement.</p> <p>27. Model what a conference would look like.</p> <p>28. Build in a cycle to determine whether it is working or not with a specific time to review and change it if necessary.</p> <p>29. Discuss the possibility with higher ed that principals come out of school knowing this evaluation system.</p>	<p>20. TELL KY is providing feedback to districts and principals around Working Conditions and the PPGES is working to capture that feedback to help principals grow in an area for which they have some control.</p> <p>21. KDE agrees with that statement and encourages the highest level of fidelity in implementing the process.</p> <p>22. Some of the timeline is bound by USED.</p> <p>23. KY is considered by other states to be approaching this process in a much more deliberate fashion. Hopefully, this helps create more successful implementation and impact.</p> <p>24. See #20 in this section.</p> <p>25. PPGES is included in the PGES newsletter and webcast. We will attempt to provide more depth in the future.</p> <p>26. By using the Year-at-a-Glance calendars, it may be easier to create smaller chunks. http://education.ky.gov/teachers/HQT/Pages/PPGES-Principal-Professional-Growth-and-Effectiveness-System.aspx.</p> <p>27. Guiding questions have been included for the superintendent to use during site visits and conferencing. Work is being done now to create a timely video to support superintendents in this process. Guiding questions can be found in the Principal Handbook at http://education.ky.gov/teachers/HQT/Pages/PPGES-Principal-Professional-Growth-and-Effectiveness-System.aspx.</p> <p>28. The pilot year will provide valuable feedback on the successes and challenges of the system.</p> <p>29. See #18 in this section.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013
TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – PRINCIPALS

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>30. Communication should be built for each level of audience around everything that comes out from KDE about this; currently it is confusing as to who needs to do what.</p> <p>31. If you ask us for questions and feedback, respond.</p> <p>32. Actually track the time it takes.</p> <p>33. KLA training should be in the summer.</p>	<p>30. We are currently working with KLA around this concept. We will also review this with those involved in the newsletter and webcast.</p> <p>31. The concern is noted.</p> <p>32. We anticipate receiving this information from participants this year.</p> <p>33. KLA launched the Professional Growth and Effectiveness System on July 10th for superintendents/principals. KDE anticipates additional training will be offered in the summer of 2014.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013
TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – PRINCIPALS

Topic	Question	Response
Concerns	<p>34. Smaller districts with new superintendents are going to struggle and need more help. Is it coming?</p> <p>35. Other than costs, we are glad that KLA is there for support.</p> <p>36. There appears to be a lack of connection between student achievement and principal/superintendent evaluation.</p> <p>37. Top level principals are indicating that this is too much and they can't do it.</p> <p>38. We do not like footing the bill to have principals trained.</p> <p>39. It is too much, too fast. (referenced Lucy candy line for visual comparison)</p> <p>40. Previous systems did not do the job because they allowed so much flexibility that the focus was not on improvement.</p> <p>41. Miscommunication exists and information seems to change each time a meeting occurs; questions are not being answered and should be answered by KDE, not trainers.</p> <p>42. The system should not be punitive but build capacity of individuals.</p>	<p>34. PGES consultants from each coop are available to help with individual district needs.</p> <p>35. Thank you for the feedback. Because of collaboration with Battelle for Kids, the cost was reduced for this year.</p> <p>36. The PPGES connects principal growth goals to both local (CSIP goals) and state (accountability) measures for student achievement.</p> <p>37. Feedback from them will be helpful in determining how the process can be streamlined. During the pilot focus groups and survey data, we encourage principals to share their concerns so that these are captured accordingly.</p> <p>38. KDE is submitting a request for funding to the legislature to assist in costs related to PGES implementation.</p> <p>39. The amount of information comment is great feedback. However, the focus is on improving student learning and success through improved instruction and leadership. Fortunately, the pilot is a year of learning without accountability to help each district/principal begin the process in a safe environment.</p> <p>40. This system focuses on growth at all levels: student, teacher, principal, superintendent. Flexibility is available in some areas, but it is within the overall structure of PGES.</p> <p>41. KDE is working with all groups to ensure consistent messaging. Some questions cannot be answered at this time.</p> <p>42. The focus of PGES is to improve effectiveness.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013
TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – PRINCIPALS

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>43. Concern exists about the cost of Val-Ed.</p> <p>44. Is it possible that doing well in the system at the beginning hurts them later when there is little to improve?</p> <p>45. It seems professional judgment goes out the window.</p> <p>46. Relationships between superintendents and principals will suffer.</p> <p>47. Will people even want to come to Kentucky to work?</p> <p>48. Concerns about small districts exist and how they will pull this off; large districts have more people to dedicate to the process.</p> <p>49. The videos are so-so.</p> <p>50. I know nothing about it and don't know where to look.</p> <p>51. The half-price cost for the pilot was not fair.</p>	<p>43. KDE is submitting a request to the legislature for additional funding to implement the system. Title II funding should focus on PGES implementation.</p> <p>44. It is the hope of KDE that everyone reaches a point where improvement is difficult. That will happen when all students are highly successful with highly successful teachers in all classrooms and when all schools and districts are led by highly successful leaders.</p> <p>45. Superintendents will still use professional judgment through formative conversations with their principals.</p> <p>46. Please clarify. Field test principals and superintendents tended to indicate that they were having significantly high-level conversations around students and their own learning.</p> <p>47. Thank you for the feedback.</p> <p>48. Collaboration is encouraged as districts consider the capacity change. Working with other districts may be an option that wasn't considered before that may be beneficial now.</p> <p>49. Thank you for the feedback.</p> <p>50. The link below will take you to the PPGES webpage and is a good starting point: http://education.ky.gov/teachers/HQT/Pages/PPGES-Principal-Professional-Growth-and-Effectiveness-System.aspx.</p> <p>51. Thank you for the feedback.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013
TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation – PRINCIPALS

Topic	Question	Response
Lessons learned from field test	<p>52. The growth plan is cumbersome.</p> <p>53. Our system has had good support, good training and a good information package.</p> <p>54. Data related to growth goals are good.</p> <p>55. Standards seem solid.</p> <p>56. Training with the co-ops is excellent.</p> <p>57. It is going really well; principals are being very professional.</p> <p>58. The Master Guide on PD 360 is a good resource; word documents in 360 are also good.</p> <p>59. I like the time of year when completed.</p> <p>60. Principals have a great attitude about this. They are trying hard.</p> <p>61. The system enables good conversations between boards and principals.</p>	<p>52. The PPGES growth plan is designed to incorporate the learning that a principal might need in order to achieve goals within the system. In some instances in the past, the growth plan did not guide or direct the principal growth for the year by encouraging new learning. While it may feel cumbersome, the intent is to encourage new learning for principals as they encourage new learning for their teachers.</p> <p>53.-61. Thank you for the feedback. This feedback does provide insight that there are great possibilities with the system. It also represents the diversity in capacity to implement across the state.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation - TEACHERS

Topic	Question	Response
Lack of effectiveness/consequences	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What if teachers/principals don't pass the test? What is KDE's position on this? 2. What is going to happen when principals mark most of the teachers as a 3 or proficient and the student overall scores cause a school to be a Focus School or Needs Improvement? What if a superintendent feels a principal is a 3 or proficient but the school still struggles in many areas? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If this references the Teachscape Observation Certification exam, the principal will not be able to complete observations until he/she is certified. The district may contact PGES consultants to provide support for the principal. Districts will need to set a policy on how they will handle a situation if a principal does not pass the proficiency exam and he/she is not able to complete his/her job description for observations/evaluations. 2. Fidelity of implementation of the system will be monitored by KDE through an audit process. Growth goals for student achievement and principal performance should be aligned to support continuous improvement.
Teacher effectiveness questions about logistics	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Since the PGES will be statewide next year, but not a part of accountability until 15-16, are we to use our current evaluation tools along with PGES in 14-15? If so, this will require double the time. 4. In 2014-15, when using the new and old evaluations, is the old still the legal document or can either be used? 5. When we do both evaluation systems, does the old one count? 6. What is the timeline for implementing PGES for teacher evaluation and accountability? 7. If districts are participating in KLA/PGES, are the resources being shared the same as KDE? Are KDE and KLA working together to develop these resources? KLA has submitted timelines and great resources for PGES. Does KDE know? 8. When do superintendents have to complete training for PGES? 9. For the pilot it says no non-tenured teachers. What if the school has only non-tenured teachers in ELL/SWD? 10. For school year 2014-15, when it is said all teachers will be using the TPGES, what does all mean? Does it mean those teachers that will be evaluated in next year's cycle or does it mean every teacher regardless of their year on the evaluation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Districts have options: one option is that when submitting the district Certified Personnel Evaluation plan for 14-15, districts can develop that plan around PGES and use their existing summative process or adopt a summative process through consultation with KDE. This would in effect establish one system that would need to be approved by the local school board. The second option would be to use two systems, PGES and the current system. 4. See #3 in this section. 5. See #3 in this section. 6. 13-14 is the statewide pilot year. 2014-15 is full implementation without consequences. 2015-16 is full implementation with personnel decisions and state accountability. 7. Yes, KDE has partnered with KLA to support PGES during this year. KDE is approving all resources KLA is using in order to maintain a consistent message. 8. Superintendents are encouraged to complete as much training in PGES as possible. Completion of any or all

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation - TEACHERS

Topic	Question	Response
	cycle?	<p>training should be in alignment with implementation efforts.</p> <p>9. It is highly recommended that non-tenured teachers not participate in the pilot, but if a district has no option given the make-up the school, then they should move ahead with having teachers participate in order to gain experience with the system. Please notify Robin Chandler at robin.chandler@education.ky.gov if this is the case in your district. Districts should use their current evaluation system until their local board has approved the use of any or all components of PGES. Districts will either use the information from the PGES process and transfer that information to their current system to arrive at a summative rating or they will have to use both systems with these teachers.</p> <p>10. It is expected that PGES will be used with all teachers but not all components with all teachers. Teachers in the evaluation cycle who are due to be observed would use all parts of the PGES system. Those not in the evaluation cycle to be observed would only use the Self-Reflection, Student Growth Goal, Student Voice Survey, and Professional Growth Plan components.</p>
Teacher effectiveness concerns and opinions	<p>11. In general, the overwhelming concerns are amount of time, insufficient staff numbers to do it well and rapid timeline for implementation into accountability.</p> <p>12. New principals have a difficult time prioritizing PGES work because scores are coming out and that is what they are working on; it is so hard to meet PGES deadlines for new people.</p> <p>13. PGES works well for classroom teachers in the field test. It may not work as well with other classifications of staff.</p> <p>14. Until an assistant is hired in every school, then someone from central office should rotate and help.</p> <p>15. There are too many new evaluation systems. Maybe we should have never applied for the waiver. Seven times today the</p>	<p>11. Time is a challenge. It is anticipated that as principals and teachers work through the system and become familiar with it during the 13-14 school year. The timeline is set forth in legislation and through the ESEA NCLB Flexibility Waiver. The PGES implementation work began over three years ago and many districts selected to participate early on while others have waited to participate. District plans should include reviewing structures and supports (conduct time audits and reallocate time based on staff needs for team meetings, observations, professional learning teams).</p> <p>12. New principals may feel overwhelmed. Support from</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation - TEACHERS

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>reason given for doing something was because of the waiver. Go back to states' rights on education, not federal.</p> <p>16. Districts do not have additional people to re-assign to assist principals with PGES. This is a tremendous cost and another unfunded mandate to be addressed.</p> <p>17. I am uncertain how effective the PGES system will be in removing ineffective tenured teachers.</p> <p>18. Concern exists about the time constraint when all teachers are a part of this.</p> <p>19. Concerns about comparability of reviewers exist.</p> <p>20. There has been a lot of backing up and redoing in the PGES development.</p> <p>21. KDE needs to train co-ops and have common language in the training.</p> <p>22. It adds a huge load on principals in small districts without assistant principals.</p> <p>23. PGES is another example of an unfunded mandate. The state needs to provide substitutes and pay for certifying costs.</p> <p>24. We need to seek data from the pilot. Then, KDE should streamline and do what the data suggests.</p> <p>25. Concern exists that districts have to pay to be in KLA for the principal training.</p> <p>26. Training videos need to be current with better sound and quality and use Kentucky exemplars.</p> <p>27. We need the resources necessary to do this right (overwhelming).</p> <p>28. Too many unknowns exist and make it hard to sell.</p> <p>29. Concern exists about it being used in accountability; it makes it seem like a conflict between encouraging improvement and rating the teacher.</p> <p>30. Unknowns exist around peer observations.</p> <p>31. Is giving a 9/6 deadline to superintendents on 9/5, even if someone in the district knew, realistic?</p> <p>32. CIITS access and role assignment concerns exist.</p>	<p>the local district office and PGES consultants at each cooperative may help alleviate this stress. District support is more critical now than ever to differentiate support for new and more experienced principals. PGES is a part of the daily responsibilities of a principal and this can be made more explicit through district support. Several education cooperatives have a special principal cohort to support principals in the region. KLA is another resource to support principals.</p> <p>13. During the 13-14 school year, "other" certified personnel will be convened by KDE to establish a work group to determine how PGES should be implemented with these certified staff. The minutes from these work groups will be posted on the KDE website and an update on the work will be shared through the PGES newsletters and ISN newsletters.</p> <p>14. This is a great way to support principals.</p> <p>15. Thank you for the feedback. If we don't adhere to the waiver at this point, almost every school in KY would not meet NCLB and there would be consequences/sanctions for all districts and schools. The flexibility received through the waiver has allowed for a new accountability model to assist KY districts/schools.</p> <p>16. Thank you for the feedback. See also #11 in this section.</p> <p>17. The system will only be as good as local fidelity of implementation. The first goal of PGES is not removal of teachers or principals but supporting their growth. Over time, if that growth does not occur, it is believed that PGES will provide a strong body of objective evidence in an effort to make informed personnel decisions.</p> <p>18. Time is a challenge. Collaboration across districts to</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation - TEACHERS

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>33. With tenure does this work matter?</p> <p>34. What about the non-tested areas?</p> <p>35. What about reoccurring costs?</p> <p>36. What is going on at the college/university level around this?</p> <p>37. Is pay a discussion as teachers get better?</p> <p>38. Is anyone taking anything off the plate?</p> <p>39. What role does EPSB play?</p> <p>40. Where does the tribunal system exist in this?</p> <p>41. What is the expected cycle for teacher evaluations?</p> <p>42. What are the weights for the teacher evaluation components?</p> <p>How will each system be scored for the accountability system?</p>	<p>see how others are finding ways to address issues of time is critical. During the 13-14 school year, KDE will be gathering additional focus group and survey data on this topic to share with districts/schools. Cooperative meetings should present an opportunity for districts to share how they are responding to issues of time management as they implement PGES. Additionally, given time is a structural and organizational concern, KASS and KASA should work with superintendents to share best practices for implementation. See also #11 in this section.</p> <p>19. If this statement is addressing comparability within observations, KDE selected the Teachscape process to address this issue. This facet was absent from previous evaluation systems which brought greater subjectivity into evaluation system ratings. Now within PGES, observers must pass an observation certification to address this issue. See the document at the following link for additional information and click on the Teachscape Observation link in the blue panel on the right side of the page: http://education.ky.gov/teachers/HQT/Pages/Teacher-Effectiveness-Articles.aspx.</p> <p>20. Since PGES was in Field Test status last year, adjustments were expected. The idea of any field test and now pilot is to work out as many challenges as possible. Many adjustments have been made based on the feedback from the field. The research presentation shared at the August KBE meeting about the field test may be located at the following link, agenda item X, http://portal.ksba.org/public/Meeting.aspx?PublicAgencyID=4388&PublicMeetingID=9441&AgencyTypeID=1</p> <p>21. Each coop has a PGES consultant and KDE works with them as a group to help ensure as common a language</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation - TEACHERS

Topic	Question	Response
		<p>as possible. These consultants meet with KDE staff monthly.</p> <p>22. District support has been critical in these cases and a distributed leadership model with teacher leaders may alleviate some of the burden of principals in this context. Discussing this challenge with like districts in the cooperative should allow for opportunities to share and problem solve.</p> <p>23. Thank you for the feedback. KDE will continue to seek funding from the legislature to support KY students. District and school leaders are encouraged to support this request to the legislature. See also #11 in this section.</p> <p>24. Data from the field test will be fully analyzed within the coming months. As preliminary data are available, KDE has used this information formatively to make appropriate adjustments. The same process will be used as data are available during the 13-14 school year implementation efforts.</p> <p>25. While there is a cost, KDE's partnership with Battelle for Kids was able to reduce that cost.</p> <p>26. Thank you for the feedback. KDE continues to look for the best way to work with technology.</p> <p>27. KDE continues to develop new resources to support implementation efforts.</p> <p>28. Thank you for the feedback.</p> <p>29. KDE has encouraged districts/schools to focus on the system's intent to improve teaching and learning. A well-researched rubric that is consistent across the state sets a standard for teaching excellence. The emphasis on continuous improvement for teachers, based on professional growth, with the use of multiple measures is appealing to all teachers.</p> <p>30. More training has just recently been released to support</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation - TEACHERS

Topic	Question	Response
		<p>the process.</p> <p>31. Thank you for the feedback. The web collector was open three times prior to this most recent deadline. The deadline was finalized due to the launch of the system's activity for the 13-14 school year.</p> <p>32. CIITS permissions will continue to be examined. Please see the previous PGES webcasts and ISN webcasts for additional information. These may be found on the KDE website. For additional information contact Maritta Horne at maritta.horne@education.ky.gov.</p> <p>33. Teacher and Leader Effectiveness will always matter in student success. A focus on continuous improvement in teaching and learning will provide additional evidence for all teachers, including tenured teachers, to improve.</p> <p>34. Teachers in non-tested areas will be a part of the system. Student Growth Goals will still be set in non-tested grades and subjects. These teachers may rely more heavily on local assessment data and evidence for program review data to support growth over time.</p> <p>35. There will be recurring costs within the system implementation. A full cost analysis of the system will be a part of the data collected during the 13-14 school year. A report will be published and shared with districts/schools within six months, prior to March 2014.</p> <p>36. Higher education faculty are getting involved. Several are attending KLA sessions to learn and then begin implementing this work in their pre-service teacher prep and education leadership programs. EPSB and CPE are in constant conversations with KDE leadership.</p> <p>37. Districts currently have the latitude to make these decisions. With more objective data from the PGES system, KDE suspects districts/schools will have new</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation - TEACHERS

Topic	Question	Response
		<p>conversations about this matter. Districts should begin re-evaluating their human capital management policies.</p> <p>38. Cooperative meetings would be a perfect place for these discussions to occur. This is a management question and learning will happen best if districts/schools are sharing their practices.</p> <p>39. EPSB has been involved in this work and is partnering with KDE to determine how they will best support higher education faculty and make modifications to their system. Specifically, KTIP will have a transition year in 2014-15 to merge this system with PGES. More information will become available about this transition in the summer of 2014.</p> <p>40. It is a little premature to discuss any changes to the tribunal system until PGES is fully implemented and there is enough data to have confidence in the system. Within the next few years, conversations may be pursued, but at this time KDE is not encouraging tribunal conversations.</p> <p>41. That is a policy decision from KBE and will be based on recommendations from the Teacher Effectiveness Steering Committee (TESC). Currently, the TESC has recommended the same cycle for summative evaluations as the current cycle...every third (3rd) year will be established for the summative evaluation year.</p> <p>42. Weighting decisions about the measures within the PGES system will be recommended by the Teacher Effectiveness Steering Committee (TESC) to the Kentucky Board of Education (KBE). The School Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability Council (SCAAC) will be discussing the model to be used for the educator effectiveness component in the Unbridled Learning Accountability model within the next few months. The meeting minutes for SCAAC are located</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation - TEACHERS

Topic	Question	Response
		<p>on the Office of Assessment and Accountability's web page on the KDE website - http://education.ky.gov/AA/KTS/Pages/SCAAC.aspx.</p>
<p>Teacher effectiveness study and things learned from field test so far</p>	<p>43. What do the validation studies say about PGES as a whole model, not just the Danielson framework? 44. Teachers like the instruments. 45. Once you go through the field test there is good teacher buy-in. 46. PGES led to the development of a more focused teacher growth plan. 47. It allows for common language among all districts and systems. 48. PGES allows for ease of documentation and upload. 49. PGES has awakened some of the tenured teachers who always relied on tenure. 50. PGES provides positive feedback. 51. The timeframes are helpful. 52. Teachers have identified goals to work toward. 53. Positive feedback exists toward student voice and student engagement measures. 54. It increases awareness of what good instruction looks like. 55. It really helps teachers understand the need for student growth. 56. Teacher components make principals stronger principals in support of instruction. 57. Multiple measures is a plus.</p>	<p>43. The validation studies for the Kentucky model will be completed during the 13-14 school year. However, the link above in question #20 provides the current information from KDE's research analyst on the emerging field test data. All of the data from the field test will be finalized during the month of October. KDE will disseminate this information broadly following the completion of all reporting. 44.-57. Thank you for the feedback. This provides insight on the effectiveness of the system as it is being used.</p>
<p>Understanding the model and suggestions</p>	<p>58. A need for clarity in student growth and voice tools exists. 59. The input parameters are not clear. 60. KDE needs to provide opportunity for pilot teachers and principals to come together for feedback to be used in improving the system and training.</p>	<p>58. KDE has provided several webcasts on student growth goal setting and on the Student Growth Percentiles for the teachers in assessed areas. Please refer to the webcasts in the KDE media portal and on the Office of Assessment and Accountability's website for more</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation - TEACHERS

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>61. Consider creating an alternative model to Teachscape to lessen face time.</p> <p>62. Videos could be more effective if they included examples of KY teachers.</p> <p>63. A need exists to provide support for all of the domains equally.</p> <p>64. More time for training to reduce 'cramming' is needed.</p> <p>65. A planning strategy to consider is: think how things are rolling out, slowing things down some, and calendaring them to have a checklist to ensure schools and districts are where they need to be.</p> <p>66. Work with EPSB and the universities to ensure principals coming out of certification programs are prepared when going into districts.</p> <p>67. Provide a rewards system such as to back off on observations if the teacher stays proficient.</p> <p>68. Convene a group for discussion around non-tested subjects and how the domains apply and will be measured.</p> <p>69. Expand the evaluation timeline to 5 years instead of 3.</p> <p>70. Given KY is doing so much, could a waiver of the waiver be requested to ensure we get it right? The system needs to prove itself before becoming a part of accountability.</p> <p>71. We need more help on what scores mean.</p> <p>72. KDE needs to design and implement a roll-out plan with districts to ensure they are on the right track.</p> <p>73. Conversations with the legislature should be moving in conjunction with these discussions with superintendents.</p>	<p>information. Student Voice plays a role in the multiple measures and gives teachers insight into how students are experiencing the learning context. Information about the use of student voice surveys may be found at http://education.ky.gov/teachers/HQT/Pages/PGES-Research.aspx.</p> <p>59. The inputs for measuring effective teaching are all the measures for the system. Observations, growth goals and student data, professional growth planning and outcomes, and student voice survey data are inputs into the system.</p> <p>60. Cooperatives can make this happen more easily within each region. ISLN meetings during the 13-14 school year will present another opportunity for this sharing. And, KLA meetings are designed so that field test participants share their experiences with new districts/schools coming aboard during the 13-14 statewide implementation.</p> <p>61. KDE continues to review options for training in the PGES system. However, the current plan is to continue with Teachscape to maintain rigor in the system's implementation.</p> <p>62. Thank you for the feedback. KDE will work to find a way to include video of Kentucky teachers; however, this can be a costly endeavor.</p> <p>63. Greater attention has been placed on domains 2 and 3 given the emphasis placed on observation training. All other data from the multiple measures in the system provide evidence for the other domains.</p> <p>64. Districts are encouraged to use this year to bring all teachers and principals into a realm of learning about the system. Even districts that are piloting the required minimum 10% should consider how other teachers and leaders in the district will learn about the system.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation - TEACHERS

Topic	Question	Response
		<p>Engaging all staff to some degree will prevent challenges in the future when the system moves to full implementation in the 14-15 school year. If not, teachers and leaders will feel the system is overwhelming.</p> <p>65. Districts are encouraged to use the Year-at-a-Glance documents as a way to have the work “chunked” into more manageable bits of information.</p> <p>66. KDE encourages districts and schools to make this request known to your local university partners and to the EPSB. KDE leadership is working with EPSB to align all systems to support educator effectiveness through PGES.</p> <p>67. Thank you for the feedback. KDE will share this with the Teacher Effectiveness Steering Committee for future consideration.</p> <p>68. Thank you for the feedback. A group of educators was convened during the 12-13 school year; however, KDE will continue to work with the various professional organizations to convene groups to discuss these critical issues.</p> <p>69. KBE will set the parameters for what the state requirements will be around evaluation timelines.</p> <p>70. KDE has submitted to the USED a request to back up the consequences component of the waiver for PGES by one year in order to gain greater confidence in the system. The current request will have the system move into accountability along with personnel decisions being made during the 15-16 school year. Until then the system will be implemented with low stakes accountability. This will enable districts 2 years to implement and work out any kinks in the overall system implementation.</p> <p>71. This statement is unclear. More information is needed</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) and Evaluation - TEACHERS

Topic	Question	Response
		<p>in order to provide a response.</p> <p>72. Some “models” do exist and have been made available. This will be the work of the PGES consultants with districts. PGES consultants will work with each district to design a context-specific implementation plan for the 13-14 school year and then for the 14-15 scaling year.</p> <p>73. Thank you for the feedback. KDE encourages you to continue conversations with legislators to support overall educator effectiveness. Staying focused on improved teaching and learning will ensure all students are taught by a highly effective teacher and all schools are lead by highly effective leaders.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: BUDGET

Topic	Question	Response
Accuracy of information	1. Answer questions accurately: We were given tax information that was not correct (amount district would rise from increase was not correct); this is not the first time this has happened.	KDE appreciates and shares this concern with having accurate information. The tax rate process is fairly complex and requires that accurate information is provided from the local PVA to the state Department of Revenue to KDE. If you have specific questions or concerns about your tax rates, please contact Chay Ritter in the Division of District Support (Chay.Ritter@education.ky.gov or 502-564-3846 ext. 4453) so that he may assist you in ensuring your tax information is accurate.
Race to the Top Funding	2. We need clarification on allowable expenditures for RTTT funding.	<p>The uses for the RTTT funds awarded by KDE to districts (MUNIS Project Number 4521) were intended to be used as outlined in the approved scope of work as submitted by each district based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The participating school district shall implement each element of the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS) as it is made available by the Kentucky Department of Education. • The participating school district shall use Race to the Top funds to assist in providing the support necessary to implement the use of the Classroom Assessment module of the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS). Support may include, but is not limited to, professional development, technical assistance and other costs associated with the effective implementation of the module. • The participating school district agrees that by the end of the grant period it will have used the CIITS system to create curriculum maps for the schools in the district. • The participating school district shall use Race to the Top funds to assist in providing the support necessary to implement the use of the Educator Development Suite (EDS) of the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS). This includes the

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: BUDGET

Topic	Question	Response
		<p>professional development sections of the EDS. Support may include, but is not limited to, professional development, technical assistance and other costs associated with the effective implementation of the module.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts selected for AdvanceKentucky may use funds to support the program.
Impact of not replacing teachers on the retirement system	3. Has anyone studied the correlation of fewer teachers hired across the state and the impact on the pension system? For the last six years, many retiring teachers are not being replaced.	KDE is not aware of any recent studies in this matter. Upon review of the information in the PSD tables posted at http://education.ky.gov/districts/FinRept/Pages/School%20District%20Personnel%20Information.aspx , the total Certified FTE decreased from 51,277.50 in 2011-12 to 50,986.88 in 2012-13. The total statewide number of teachers has not declined significantly over the past two years; however, with additional reductions in staffing and sequestration being an even greater concern moving forward, KDE will be monitoring this information closely and we will share concerns with EPSB for consideration in any future study.
Affordable Care Act	4. How will the new Affordable Health Care Act impact districts?	KDE is working with both the state Personnel Cabinet and local finance officers to provide ongoing guidance about the Affordable Healthcare Act. For assistance with specific questions, please contact Susan Barkley at Susan.Barkley@education.ky.gov or 502-564-3930, ext. 4437.
	5. Concern exists about health care to substitutes. Is there an option out if a spouse covers the employee?	Unfortunately, the federal law doesn't allow for this. The responsibility of the district is to identify eligible employees and offer those employees coverage. Whether an individual has access to coverage elsewhere is not a factor.
Health insurance	6. Does the health insurance projection reflect the amount we are paying for health insurance from our federal funds?	No, this information reflects general funds spent on district health insurance.

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: BUDGET

Topic	Question	Response
	7. Retired classified employees have to pay health insurance even if it is not state insurance. A new policy needs to be in place to require state insurance.	The question behind this statement is unclear. Please contact Susan Barkley at Susan.Barkley@education.ky.gov for further assistance with this specific concern.
REDBOOK	<p>8. Please help bring some common sense and reason to the REDBOOK regulations; we are now dealing with specific examples such as the following:</p> <p>a) Schools collect gate money at football games. This money can be used to stripe the field but cannot be used to mow the fields. So, staff are wasting our most valuable resource, time, to transport money to the district office so the district can pay the mowing bill.</p> <p>b) Gate dollars cannot be used to purchase the toilet paper used in the outdoor restrooms and the football field because that restroom is used by adults and students. There are other examples; however, these are illustrative of the nonsense.</p>	KDE has and will continue to work with school finance officers on maximizing flexibility. We are also updating our FAQ on the Redbook on a regular basis because of such discussions. See: http://education.ky.gov/districts/FinRept/Pages/Accounting-Procedures-for-School-Activity-Funds.aspx . In a nutshell, the Redbook applies only to school activity funds, if the district chooses to deposit revenues into the district activity fund, this will allow for maximum flexibility. Additional information was also provided in the Commissioner's Friday email of 9/13/13 and is reflected in the FAQ.
Unfunded mandates	9. For 3 years our districts have not had any money to add initiatives we want but yet we keep getting mandates on how we spend our dollars. Please look at any new KDE initiatives (such as PGES) to see if it will cost the districts money.	KDE appreciates all of the concerns identified in questions 9-12. Districts have made great progress in a very difficult budgetary climate and are to be commended for their incredible efforts in the face of such economic adversity. As Commissioner Holliday noted at the Superintendents' Summit, all critical SB 1 initiatives are now underway and no such new initiatives are anticipated.

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: BUDGET

Topic	Question	Response
	<p>10. Unfunded mandates are an issue. KSBA is stressing taking things off the plate. The same focus is needed by all.</p> <p>11. If we receive additional funding we have to have no more unfunded mandates. (PGES, restraint and seclusion, etc.)</p> <p>12. Understand that even training is an unfunded mandate.</p>	KDE will strongly oppose any new unfunded mandates from the state and federal level.
ADA	13. Why are we still using ADA instead of average membership?	KDE financial staff are having this discussion too. Converting to Average Daily Membership (ADM) has many advantages over Average Daily Attendance (ADA). However, in order to ensure that districts do not lose significant per pupil funding in such a transition, we would require significant additional funding (several hundred million) from the legislature during the transition period, to hold districts harmless and keep funding per pupil levels stable (otherwise the per pupil amount would drop sharply during the transition). This will require much more legislative funding. KDE is monitoring this critical issue, because timing will be critical.
Kindergarten funding	14. Why are we pushing preschool funding when we do not have all-day kindergarten funding?	KDE is considering requesting flexible focus funding (including preschool) be restored to FY 08 levels, due to the significant reductions that districts have sustained to this program since the FY 08 level. That does not mean that kindergarten is not important, but flexible focus grants as a whole may allow for more flexibility at the local level when new funding is tight.

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: BUDGET

Topic	Question	Response
Facilities	15. Facilities needs were not addressed.	The initial Parsons study in 2011 identified several billion dollars in facility needs and we have already provided that to the legislature for action. At this point in time, without any significant new revenue sources, the fate of any legislative action on this model is currently uncertain; however, KDE has and will continue to push on this item and strongly supports funding for the facilities based on the Parsons' process.
	16. Add a budget priority of the Parsons' group in regard to facility needs. There has to be some help for facilities.	The initial Parsons study in 2011 identified several billion dollars in facility needs and we have already provided that to the legislature for action. At this point in time, without any significant new revenue sources, the fate of any legislative action on this model is currently uncertain; however, KDE has and will continue to push on this item and strongly supports funding for the facilities based on the Parsons' process.
Flexible funding; the message; priorities	17. We support flexibility of funding.	KDE agrees and will continue work to support this item.
	18. We need to increase revenue and get that message out to all levels.	KDE agrees and will continue work to support this item.
	19. Focusing on SEEK funds is the top priority.	KDE agrees and will continue work to support this item.
	20. Priorities 2 and 3 should be switched.	We will provide this information to the KBE at their October meeting.
	21. Any money received locally must have flexibility attached to it.	KDE agrees and will continue work to support this item.
	22. We shouldn't have to choose what is more important; all of the programs need funding.	KDE agrees.
	23. Keep the budget strategy simple.	KDE agrees.
	24. KDE should work with the co-ops to build a unified budget and then use it to impact local legislators.	KDE is communicating with KEAT and our other educational partners on these very strategies.
	25. Charts should be combined with other data in the approach.	KDE agrees and will continue work to support this item.
	26. Prioritize budget areas but share all funding issues.	KDE understands the intent behind this statement and will consider this as part of the final budget preparation process.

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: BUDGET

Topic	Question	Response
	27. Without more state funding, it is becoming an equity issue.	KDE agrees with the intent of this statement as it relates to inadequacy of funding. This relates to what Dr. Shelton discussed about future plans for an adequacy study. Dr. Holliday also briefly discussed this issue in his blog post of August 23, 2013.
	28. CCR results are connected to the workplace with this approach.	KDE agrees.
	29. Funding for CTE should be a priority and equitable funding should be ensured.	KDE agrees and has included CTE funding as a priority to submit for approval to the board in the budget request (see ABR #4 on Hiren's presentation).
	30. Why not ask for projected amounts for ADA instead of the 09 year? Funding must exist to account for changes.	This item also relates to what Dr. Shelton discussed about future plans for an adequacy study. We don't currently have that data available today, so the 09 SEEK per pupil data currently serves as a substitute.
	31. Equity between districts is a real issue that may help with adequacy.	KDE agrees with this statement. This relates to what Dr. Shelton discussed about future plans for an adequacy study. Dr. Holliday discussed this issue in his blog post of August 23, 2013.
	32. Will KDE push legislators to match the funding for those districts who adopted the recallable nickel tax last fall?	KDE will coordinate with legislative staff to include this information and push for it. The final outcome will depend on the budget process and it may be that (like the current budget) depending upon the date of the levy, the equalization maybe at 25% in the next biennial budget period.
	33. The general consensus for SEEK, technology and Flex Focus and not grants but funding existed in one table of 9.	The question behind this statement is unclear. For the individual who submitted this comment, please contact Hiren Desai at Hiren.Desai@education.ky.gov for clarification.
	34. I like a unified voice with a small number of priorities.	KDE will use the Commissioner's communication methods to keep districts informed about delivery as a continuous improvement model and make it a focus internally to make sure we are communicating information about the delivery targets. KDE will continue to reach out as follow-up with the Summit participants as well as with District Assessment Coordinators (DACs).

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: BUDGET

Topic	Question	Response
	35. Independent districts don't get a fair share.	KDE understands the intent behind this statement. No further response is required.
	36. Change the date to Nov. 1.	KDE will discuss this item further with the KASBO Advisory Committee in order to identify a workable solution.
The message	37. In general , the consensus is that a few is better than many although there are dissenters. Some disagreement exists about the priority list but SEEK is first and then technology across most all groups.	See question #53 in this section.
	38. Reserves are dwindling. A lawsuit against the state for not funding education should be pursued.	KDE understands the intent behind this note, but cannot comment on potential litigation.
	39. A different month needs to exist for reporting fund balances.	See question #36 in this section.
	40. Legislators need a history lesson.	KDE understands the intent behind this statement.
	41. Why do legislators object to districts having fund balances but they have money in their rainy day fund?	KDE understands the intent behind this statement.
	42. We need to track student expenses.	This information is reported on the school report card. If you have additional recommendations or suggestions for this process, please do not hesitate to contact Hiren Desai at Hiren.Desai@education.ky.gov .
	43. We need to get organized and use community members to get the message out on tax reform.	KDE agrees and will continue work to support this item.
	44. A myth exists on how much 4% can actually raise for a county. It is different by county.	KDE agrees and will continue work to dispell this myth.
	45. Legislators are raising taxes by their failure to act.	This is understood. Dr. Holliday discussed this very issue in his blog post of August 23, 2013.
	46. Build same passion as with SB 97.	KDE agrees and will continue work to support this item.
	47. Provide simple visuals that all can use and	KDE agrees and will continue work to support this item.

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: BUDGET

Topic	Question	Response
The message	follow.	
	48. Incorporate KEAT slides with Hiren's presentation.	KDE is in the process of discussing a unified strategy with KEAT.
	49. Share talking points and advertisements with superintendents for a common message.	KDE agrees and will continue work to support this item.
	50. The discussion is meaningless unless it is in Governor's budget.	The KDE budget request informs the Governor's Office on the critical need for educational funding and is also used as the basis for taking strong executive branch action on key priorities during the upcoming session. It also serves as a single platform for unified discussion on the subject of educational funding during the session.
	51. Show overall fund balances going down. Educate the legislature on what the fund balance at local levels is.	This is understood. KDE will continue to work on educating legislators on the difficult realities of school funding.
	52. KDE needs to mention all priorities so they don't fall off the radar but still focus on a few.	See question #26 in this section.
	53. We need one voice of concern, it shows cowardice not to ask for everything.	KDE appreciates the intent of this statement. For the last several budget cycles, asking for everything has resulted in nothing happening, so a different approach may be warranted; however, we certainly recognize that it may be equally as unsuccessful.
	54. We need to have a day in February when all superintendents show up at the legislature.	KDE agrees and will continue work to support this item.
	55. Nothing is left to cut but people.	KDE agrees.
	56. Tie it to things people can see.	KDE agrees and will continue work to support this item.
	57. Help the community understand the 4% and what it means.	See question #44 in this section.

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: BUDGET

Topic	Question	Response
	58. Impact of inflation should be included.	KDE understands the intent of this statement, but would caution that, since the final budget bill process is based on actual amounts which are not adjusted for inflation, having a conversation with legislators about inflation-adjusted figures results in significant confusion. KDE recommends sticking to actual budget numbers so that the opportunities for miscommunication are reduced.
	59. How much would be needed if everyone took the 4%?	There is no easy way to calculate this because the state match varies based on the various components in the SEEK formula and individual district data, including local property assessments, tax rates and other factors.
Tax reform	60. What details can we support regarding tax reform?	The recent study by the Governor's Blue Ribbon Commission on Tax Reform is informative. A link to this study is provided for easy reference: http://ltgovernor.ky.gov/taxreform/Documents/Report/TaxReformCommissionReportFinal.pdf . A summary of all the Commission's recommendations are provided on Pages 7 to 11. An item which should be of particular interest to superintendents is the detailed proposal on Page 37 to impose a gross receipts tax of 1 percent on both residential and business utilities and dedicate these additional revenues to the SEEK funding formula. The General Assembly could choose to pass this proposal as a stand-alone revenue-generating measure for K-12 education, if enough legislators and their constituent school districts supported this proposal. At a minimum, KDE would encourage superintendents to discuss this particular item with their local legislators. KDE will continue to monitor the discussion on tax reform and provide additional updates as new information becomes available.
	61. It was mentioned at several tables but it is not clear what the plan would be.	See response to #60 in this section.

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: BUDGET

Topic	Question	Response
KSBIT concerns	62. More information is needed on an "Errors and Omissions" liability claim being made.	Unfortunately KDE cannot speculate on the viability of a liability claim against KSBIT, based on the KSBIT Board's Errors and Omissions policy. That would depend on a number of factors, including the terms and conditions of the policy and coverage amounts, and KDE does not have that information. KDE would strongly recommend that districts engage local board counsels in this discussion prior to any decisions being made at the local level on litigation.
	63. Are colleges being held accountable for their portion?	Yes, these estimates are included at www.ksbit.org .
	64. Who's in charge? KSBA got us into the mess.	KDE understands the intent behind this statement.
	65. How will the methodology be determined for districts to share the least expense and who will determine it?	The Kentucky Department of Insurance (DOI) is in the process of engaging in a legal administrative hearing process with KSBIT to determine these matters. The Commissioner of the DOI, or her legal designee, is the final decision-maker at the state level on determining whether the methodology and the assessment amounts are actuarially sound.
	66. What if we don't pay? What about 0% over 20 years?	(1) Under state law, if the payment methodology and amounts are ratified by the Kentucky Department of Insurance (DOI) and non-payment occurs, a state intercept of funds would occur, pursuant to Senate Bill 202(3) (2013 RS). (2) KDE supports maximum flexibility for districts to make payments according to their individual needs. The KISTA program will provide great flexibility; however, the financing option is taxable under state law. Neither KDE nor the DOI have the legal authority to waive intercepts or make financing non-taxable.
	67. Stick to timeline that is set for solving the problems. The dates keep changing.	KDE understands. The dates have changed because the KSBIT Board of Directors has not yet approved the final plan for submission to DOI so that the administrative hearing process can move forward.

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: BUDGET

Topic	Question	Response
	68. The longer this situation drags out, does it increase the costs?	Probably. In some scenarios, the cost may go down, if claims start being paid (they are currently on hold). Regardless, the longer the situation drags out, the more difficult it will become to predict how it ends.
	69. Districts need to see a breakdown of costs.	KDE will convey this request to KSBIT.
	70. Better policies and regulations for workmen's compensation need to exist in Kentucky.	KDE understands the intent behind this statement.
	71. Local boards say the KSBIT situation hurts the credibility of KSBA and it takes money from the kids.	KDE understands the intent behind this statement.
	72. A list of school districts with KSBIT premiums vs. losses needs to be provided.	KDE will convey this request to KSBIT.
	73. Why did the Department of Insurance or the board not require KSBIT to be audited?	KDE's understanding is that annual audits of KSBIT were conducted, but we would have to defer to those entities for a more detailed response.
	74. We want to see documentation on the contractual arrangement and payments. There needs to be a KSBIT audit.	KDE has no direct legal authority over KSBIT but will convey this information as appropriate.
	75. Is KSBA responsible?	KDE understands the intent behind the statement.
	76. KSBIT continued paying out when it was in trouble; how?	KDE will convey this to KSBIT.
	77. There needs to be a balance of percentage of contingency as KSBIT must be paid off.	See question #65 in this section.
	78. We feel blind sided.	KDE understands the intent behind this statement.
	79. We want to see actual claims for each district to balance with charges. We are all punished as opposed to an effectiveness determination.	KDE will convey this request to KSBIT.
KSBIT payment options	80. Money should be borrowed from other areas.	KDE will convey this to KSBIT.
	81. We prefer not to pay.	See question #66 (1) in this section.
	82. A local option for each county should be	See question #66 (2) in this section.

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: BUDGET

Topic	Question	Response
	allowed.	
	83. How was the final number reached? Who created this final number? Is KSBA incurring any of the obligation for paying this amount and if not, why?	This is still to be determined. See question #67 in this section.
	84. Years of extension to pay should be offered.	See question #66 (2) in this section.
	85. Any options to pay this are equally painful. We prefer not to pay.	See question #66 (1) in this section.
	86. An audit should occur. Districts need to see the actual numbers of what occurred.	See questions #73 and #74 in this section.
	87. Concern exists on the quality of the numbers.	See question #65 in this section.
	88. One table reports 80% going with a lump sum, one would fight over paying anything and one thinks 20 years with no interest.	See question #66 in this section.
	89. We need firm dates.	See question #67 in this section.
	90. What about KISTA?	See question #66 (2) in this section.

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Topic	Questions	Response
Suggestions on how to adjust the accountability model	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How about making the accountability formula only on CCR; get 100% ready for life! This saves dollars and gets all systems working on this. 2. We need a greater level of accountability at middle school for CCR. 3. We need an incentive built into the accountability model for early graduation. 4. In order to revamp career-ready, there needs to be a different test for the vocational side. 5. Think long and hard before changing anything. 6. Do away with EOC; use MAP Gmade; and consider subject exams. 7. The growth component is weighted too high at elementary; the growth model is overly arbitrary and flawed. This counts too much in accountability, particularly at elementary. 8. Achievement data should hold more weight. 9. We need to revamp the career-ready component. What does career-ready really mean? 10. The current percentages for accountability for elementary schools are not appropriate with academic at 30%, growth at 40%, and gap at 30%. There needs to be something where the actual academic score counts more, for instance, one that would make realistic sense. Statistically, all fairness would result in academic 60% or more, growth 20% or less, and gap 20% or less. 11. The system has too many measures and is too complex. 12. Abandon Pearson; align arrows toward 	<p>Comments 1-24 dealt with ideas for changing the accountability system. KDE asked the Kentucky Board of Education for permission to come back after the 2013-14 school year to conduct a thorough review of the accountability system and entertain changes based on two years of trend data. Two to three years of trend data are important to gather before making adjustments. Many of the ideas in this list have value for those discussions that will be held in the fall of 2014. KDE will hold onto these ideas and bring them back for review.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Topic	Questions	Response
	<p>ACT.</p> <p>13. Keep the system long enough to see that it works.</p> <p>14. Replace the EOC with a yearly assessment.</p> <p>15. Make CCR a requirement for graduation (has happened in one district).</p> <p>16. Achievement should have more weight.</p> <p>17. ACT needs more weight.</p> <p>18. You need to work on adjusting the accountability model and report card for schools with unconventional configurations. (example: grades 1-3 schools)</p> <p>19. High performers who are getting it done should be given flexibility in the timeframe to implement things like PGES as a recognition and reward of taking care of business. Lower performers need to be the focus for obvious reasons.</p> <p>20. Too much emphasis on graduation rate exists.</p> <p>21. Middle school CCR should not be limited to EXPLORE at the beginning of the year. There is no way to improve by end of the year.</p> <p>22. Make names/labels around accountability meaningful.</p> <p>23. Language of the 70th percentile and 90th percentile is misleading, even if locked.</p> <p>24. Align annual testing with common core instead of end-of-course.</p>	
End-of-Course (EOC)	<p>25. You need to work on tablet-compatible tests. Many schools have this tool and kids respond well to this type of technology.</p>	<p>25. The problem with using tablets for electronic testing rests with an industry-wide problem of not being able to lock down the tablet during testing. Locking down the tablet</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Topic	Questions	Response
	<p>26. We need multiple test forms for EOC.</p> <p>27. If a student takes a course out of sequence, can the EOC be given out of sequence (re: as a sophomore vs. junior for US history)?</p> <p>28. Make the technology sufficient to have the assessment system work and get scores back. On-line testing either works or doesn't.</p> <p>29. How is EOC matching up with ACT?</p>	<p>simply means that the student can't access the Internet, e-mail, text messaging, etc. during the test. This is a national industry-wide problem, but the major test vendors are working on a solution. Once an industry solution is provided, KDE will allow tablets for online tests. There is no problem with the KDE system and tablets; it falls for the tablet industry to solve.</p> <p>26. KDE agrees and has been working with ACT to provide more forms of the EOC tests. More forms open more scheduling options for schools and provide a breach form for security purposes.</p> <p>27. Students take the EOC test when they complete the course associated with the test. There is not an order to the EOC tests.</p> <p>28. ACT is working to fix the problems in their online testing system. KDE is working with ACT to make the online testing system a reliable method for administering the tests. Scores are returned immediately when the system works. There is a statewide Stress Test scheduled for November of 2013. All high schools are highly encouraged to participate. After the stress test, KDE will know if the issues experienced last May have been fixed.</p> <p>29. The EOC tests were designed to be directly linked to the ACT scale and the skills needed to do well on the ACT. EOC provides a direct prediction of how a student will do on the ACT tests. Both the EOC and ACT are created by the same company in order to provide this linking ability.</p>
Growth	<p>30. Growth should be at the school level, not student level.</p> <p>31. If a school is already a high scorer, it's hard to grow students. We need models of proficient work.</p> <p>32. We need more training on growth and more</p>	<p>30. The concept of "growth" is to show how a student performed year to year. Currently, improvement scores are generated for schools and districts.</p> <p>31. In the Student Growth Percentile (SGP) model used in Kentucky for Growth, students are placed into academic peer groups. The student's performance from year to year</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Topic	Questions	Response
	emphasis on growth.	<p>is compared to this band of students, and within each band there will be 60% of the students showing acceptable annual growth. This applies to even the students in the highest performance levels.</p> <p>32. KDE agrees and will create additional growth explanations. The KDE website does have a number of Growth Model explanations on the web, but it will help to update them.</p>
Communication	<p>33. Keep us in touch with what is happening with the accountability system and districts of innovation.</p> <p>34. Better communication about targets and delivery is needed.</p> <p>35. Grade reports are not parent friendly.</p>	<p>33. KDE will use the Commissioner's communication methods to keep districts informed of the work in the districts of innovation.</p> <p>34. KDE will use the Commissioner's communication methods to keep districts informed about delivery as a continuous improvement model and the delivery targets communicate the questions at the Summit and ask DACS for answers.</p> <p>35. KDE will review the parent reports with DACS. In addition, a parent focus group will be used to review the reports.</p>
Earlier Data Release	<p>36. We would like to get data earlier, perhaps July, before school starts.</p> <p>37. We need individual student data back by the last week of July in order to make adjustments for serving students.</p> <p>38. Writing pieces need to be assessed with digital tools so you get results earlier.</p> <p>39. The superintendents need to see test data and information at the same time as DACs. Superintendents need the rights to access the data.</p> <p>40. Can we get scores earlier?</p> <p>41. What would the legislative response be to funding a superior test with instant results</p>	<p>36.-41. Many comments concerned earlier access to test scores. This year individual test scores were returned on August 2; however, many of the comments asked for scores in July. KDE will continue to work with its vendors to increase the turnaround time. There are two issues at play. First, Kentucky still uses constructed response questions that require human scorers. Pearson, for instance, hires over 900 employees to score Kentucky tests. Increased turnaround time can be accomplished, but it comes with financial cost that is currently outside the KDE budget. The testing industry is exploring the use of intelligent scoring for quicker turnaround. This technology is increasing in its viability but is still not ready for wide-scale use.</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Topic	Questions	Response
	that could be used for goal setting?	
Program Review	<p>42. How will the World Language Program Review (WLPR) be implemented? There are a lot of questions regarding the WLPR's design, development and scoring; no more mandates are needed from KDE on testing.</p> <p>43. There needs to be improvement in Program Review data. We spend too much time on it. The Program Review process has too much subjectivity to it.</p> <p>44. Go back to assessments in the Program Review areas; we are concerned soft skills assessments are replacing academic assessments.</p>	<p>42. World Language Program Reviews are on a slower timeline for implementation. During the 13-14 school year, districts will be piloting the implementation and KDE will solicit feedback on the rubrics and program implementation in order to make adjustments for full implementation. KDE will be delaying the implementation schedule for this Program Review.</p> <p>43. KDE has contracted with Dr. Xin Ma at the University of Kentucky to conduct a validity study of the Program Reviews in order to respond to the legislature's concerns about subjectivity in their implementation. Currently, these studies indicate that there is little subjectivity in the process when schools are making their overall ratings and that when the schools are identifying evidence to rate on the rubrics the evidence appears to match the expectations of each Program Review area. District and community involvement in the process should also support an objective review.</p> <p>44. Kentucky used tests to measure Arts/Humanities and Practical Living in the CATS system. The outcome was a narrowing of the curriculum due to limitations of testing. SB1 opened the door to try to measure these subject areas in a new way called Program Reviews. The purpose was to make sure these subject matters stayed as important parts of a total curriculum, but provide relief from assessments that narrowed the curriculum. As this new model of Program Reviews moves forward, KDE and the Kentucky Board of Education will continue to monitor its effectiveness and need for changes.</p>
Questioning the Value of State Accountability	<p>45. Is there really any value to all of this accountability model?</p> <p>46. State ranking puts a hyper-focus on testing.</p>	<p>45.-50. A set of comments were made concerning the value of the state accountability model. From a general perspective state accountability models will most likely always be</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Topic	Questions	Response
	<p>47. No one understands the accountability score.</p> <p>48. It doesn't provide the public with a clear picture of school performance or meaning.</p> <p>49. With so many things, what do we focus on?</p> <p>50. Rigor vs. graduation rate causes problems.</p>	<p>required as long as state tax money is invested in education. The legislators and the public need a way to determine how their monetary investment is being used. School leaders also need a way to determine effectiveness. A more specific concern might be stated as follows: Is the current model of any value? As stated in the section called "Suggestions on how to improve the Accountability Model", there will be a future review of the model and adjustments proposed.</p>
General Questions	<p>51. We need directions on how to explain to the public and the board that you are a Focus School by one point. Some labels are misleading. Only 1 point can make a school a Focus School, which can be misleading in the true magnitude of the problem to the average person.</p> <p>52. Formative assessments (MAP, Discovery Ed) don't align with ACT.</p> <p>53. It is hard to set goals on K-PREP because there is little diagnostic information. Can't the state tests provide more drill-down on diagnostics?</p> <p>54. Can FMD scores be sent back to the home school and not the school in the FMD unit of location?</p> <p>55. Who are non-gap kids?</p> <p>56. Are we still operating on the 100 number system like in the past?</p>	<p>51. It is true that one point may tilt a school into the Focus category; however, both Focus calculations are locating the absolutely lowest scores in the gap groups in the state. Though one point may raise a score above Focus, it would still mean that the group of students is scoring at the lowest points in the whole state. Focus selects literally the lowest 1% of individual groups or the lowest 10% of the non-duplicated gap group.</p> <p>52. KDE believes these companies are conducting alignment studies between their tests and the state assessments. It is imperative that these vendors conduct alignment studies and make adjustments so their tests provide worthwhile information for districts. It is imperative on districts to make sure assessment vendors can deliver products that assist with instructional and curriculum improvements.</p> <p>53. When Kentucky moved to a common test for all students, the amount of test items was reduced significantly. In the old test, with a matrix model, each subject area might have had over 180 questions. With this many questions it is easy to provide more diagnostic information. With a common test, our item pool is reduced to approximately 45. This reduces the amount of diagnostic information. It is critical that districts create or contract with a vendor who supplies regular diagnostic data to make decisions. It is also critical to make sure the curriculum is aligned with the Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS) and that instruction is at</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Topic	Questions	Response
		<p>an engaging and rigorous level.</p> <p>54. If the unit is located in an A1 school, then no. The system is built to provide accountability to the A1 school that teaches the student. If the unit is within an alternative school, then the student's score does move back to the home school.</p> <p>55. White and Asian are Non-Free and Reduced Lunch. These two groups are traditionally higher scoring students even though it varies inside the group.</p> <p>56. No, not quite. The current model uses percentiles that run from 1 – 99. It is still the goal in Kentucky to get all students Proficient, but the accountability model uses percentiles for determining the location of schools.</p>
College and Career Ready	<p>57. Passing on the EOC with a B or better should be college-ready or at least included in CCR.</p> <p>58. Can we develop a career-ready pathway and designation for the arts? We have kids who want to pursue this career path in a way other than college.</p> <p>59. Industry certificates may be too easy to get; do they meet standards?</p>	<p>57. Currently, the Council on Postsecondary Education determines the college-ready standards. They use the ACT, KYOTE, and COMPASS scores as their measures. KDE has talked with CPE about the use of EOC and even Advanced Placement tests for college placement. CPE is aware of the request and is reviewing it.</p> <p>58. Yes, it is the intent of the Office of Career and Technical Education in collaboration with the Office of Next Generation Learners to prepare career pathways for the creative and performing arts. The work related to career pathway development will begin this fall (2013). The goal is to establish sample pathway templates and identify technical skill attainment measures that can be implemented by schools and districts during the 2014-2015 academic year.</p> <p>59. A certification must meet the criteria identified below to be considered for federal Perkins Accountability and the Career Readiness component for Kentucky Department of Education College/Career Readiness Accountability. The criteria were established with input from business and</p>

Questions from Superintendents' Summit September 5, 2013

TOPIC: ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Topic	Questions	Response
		<p>industry representatives and professional associations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Recognized, endorsed, or required by industry b. Written and verified by national or state industries c. Curriculum and certification aligned with state and/or national standards d. Certification must be an end-of-program assessment related to the student's identified career pathway achieved through a sequence of courses. <p>Individuals may recommend other certifications that meet the above criteria be added to the official list of KOSSA/Industry Certifications. The process and form for recommending industry certifications can be found on the KDE website: http://education.ky.gov/CTE/kossa/Pages/ValidKOSSAList.aspx.</p>
EXPLORE/PLAN	<p>60. What assessment is taking the place of EXPLORE/PLAN and how will we ensure it aligns to the ACT at the 11th grade? We need to be able to have an assessment which aligns and enables us to monitor and plan for growth.</p> <p>61. Concern exists about moving from EXPLORE/PLAN; the new test must be aligned.</p> <p>62. In general, many concerns were expressed regarding replacing EXPLORE/PLAN and alignment with ACT of next iteration.</p> <p>63. Is ACT's new ASPIRE testing model by grade level?</p>	<p>60.-63. Several questions came in concerning the removal of EXPLORE/PLAN testing by ACT. As many of you know, the EXPLORE/PLAN test is being phased-out by ACT. They do not have a direct replacement for this test, but they are creating a Common Core test called ASPIRE that can be given from grades 3-10. KDE is currently writing a Request for Proposal (RFP) to see what types of tests are on the market for the high school testing model.</p>